## Case3:04-cr-00317-MHP Document177 Filed04/30/07 Page1 of 4 1 MICHAEL L. HINCKLEY (CSBN 161645) LIDIA S. STIGLICH (CSBN 182100) STIGLICH & HINCKLEY, LLP 2 502 Seventh Street San Francisco, California 94103 3 415-865-2539 Tel: 4 415-865-2538 Fax: 5 Attorney for Defendant CHARLES EDWARD LEPP 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No. CR 05 00317 MHP 11 Plaintiff. 12 DEFENDANT'S REQUEST FOR RULING v. ON MOTIONS; SUPPLEMENTAL 13 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES CHARLES EDWARD LEPP, et. al 14 Date: May 30, 2007 15 Defendants. Time: 9:30 a.m. Courtroom: Hon. Marilyn Hall Patel 16 17 TO: SCOTT N. SCHOOLS, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY C. DAVID HALL AND THE CLERK OF THE COURT: 18 Defendant CHARLES EDWARD LEPP, by and through his counsel Michael L. 19 Hinckley, herein request the Court consider the attached Supplemental Points and Authorities in 20 ruling on the previously filed and argued motions held in abeyance by the Court pending the 21 Supreme Court's ruling in Ashcroft v. Raich. 22 DATED: Respectfully submitted, 23 24 STIGLICH & HINCKLEY, LLP 25 /S/

26

27

MICHAEL L. HINCKLEY Attorneys for Defendant CHARLES EDWARD LEPP

28 Law Offices

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

In a written Memorandum & Order dated February 8, 2005, this Court held that Reverend Eddy Lepp's remaining jurisdictional motions be held in abeyance pending the Supreme Court's ruling in *Ashcroft v. Raich*, 124 S.Ct. 2902, (2004).

The Supreme Court has since issued its decision in *Gonzales v. Raich*, 125 S.Ct. 2195 (2005), vacating and remanding the Ninth Circuit ruling in *Raich v. Ashcroft*, 353 F.3d 1222 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003).

Specifically, the Supreme Court disagreed with the Ninth Circuit's favorable ruling on Raich's claim that application of the Controlled Substance Act ("CSA") to persons growing, possessing, and/or using marijuana for medical purposes in a manner authorized under state law violates the commerce clause. Relying heavily on *Wickard v. Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111 (1942), the Supreme Court held application of the CSA to individuals such as Raich, was constitutional and did not violate the commerce clause.

The defense, of course, acknowledges *Gonzales v. Raich* is binding authority and, as such, will submit on the issue, save the following points: (1) the defense believes *Gonzales v. Raich* was wrongly decided and wishes to preserve the issue for potential subsequent review; (2) the defense wishes to include in the at-issue motions the charges added via Superseding Indictment subsequent to the filing of Mr. Lepp's initial brief and hearing; and (3) note that the factual characteristics analyzed in Raich's cases, while analogous to the case at bench, did not include an analysis of the application of the CSA to persons, like Reverend Lepp, who contend that they manufacture, possess, and use marijuana for religious purposes. The defense recognizes that Reverend Lepp's rights in this regard are specifically protected, and more appropriately addressed via the Religious Freedom Restoration Act [RFRA] defense which Reverend Lepp intends to present at trial.

///

26 ///

27 ///

Law Offices

Stiglich & Hinckley

## Case3:04-cr-00317-MHP Document177 Filed04/30/07 Page3 of 4 CONCLUSION For the foregoing reasons, with the Supplemental Points and Authorities filed herein, Reverend Lepp hereby submits the previously filed jurisdictional motions and requests a ruling. DATED: Respectfully submitted, STIGLICH & HINCKLEY, LLP /S/MICHAEL L. HINCKLEY Attorneys for Defendant CHARLES EDWARD LEPP

Law Offices
Stiglich & Hinckley